DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 152 927 UD 018 124

AUTHOR Thiemann, Francis C.; Deflaminis, John A.
TITLE Necessity's Sharp Pinch: Title I Under Conditions of Merger and Desegregation.
PUB DATE Mar 78
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting (Toronto, Canada, March, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Compensatory Education Programs; Educational Problems; *Federal Programs; *Integration Effects; Integration Plans; *Mergers; *Program Administration; School Districts; *School Integration
IDENTIFIERS Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; *Kentucky (Jefferson County)

ABSTRACT

This paper summarizes a study of Title I regulations and related problems which local administrators in Jefferson County, Kentucky dealt with. More specifically, the study determined which, if any, regulations were significant factors which created problems in the desegregation process and what administrative actions were taken to overcome them. Many of the problems emanated from federal regulations which were not necessarily written to accommodate school districts undergoing such disruptive changes as merger and desegregation. Needs assessments, the "continuing eligibility" amendment, school and child identification procedures, evaluation of students' progress, parent advisory councils, teacher aides, and whether the Title I money should follow the child are the problems discussed. In each area the problems are explicated fully, often employing verbatim respondent quotes. Recommendations are made. One of the limitations of the study is that it is difficult to know which problems identified were due to merger and desegregation, since the conditions pre and post 1975-76 are not known and were not systematically examined. Another limitation of the study is that it did not include school level personnel and parent opinions. In addition, the problems encountered with some respondents in the study raise questions as to the validity of some responses to the instrument used. Finally, it is most difficult to address, ex post facto, regulation issues and to address meaningful recommendations and questions. (Author/AM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED152927

NECESSITY'S SHARP PINCH: TITLE I UNDER CONDITIONS OF MERGER AND DESEGREGATION

by

Francis C. Thiemann
John A. DeFlaminis

University of Louisville

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Francis C. Thiemann
John A. DeFlaminis

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Session 23.04
Presentation Paper
American Educational Research Association
Toronto, Canada, 1978

INTRODUCTION

Congressional interest in rethinking the purpose and regulations of Title I stimulated the National Institute of Education to sponsor twenty separate studies throughout the United States in 1976-77. One of those studies is partially reported here. It was the purpose of the major study to ascertain the effects of Title I regulations on administrators' behavior during merger and desegregation. Jefferson County Public School District, Kentucky, was the study site selected since it, within a one-month period in 1975, had been required to merge a bankrupt city district (with 40% Title I eligibility) into a healthy and growing county system (with 9% eligibility) and then to desegregate under a U. S. District Court order. Jefferson County School District became, upon merger, the thirteenth largest school district in the nation with 5,787 teachers and administrators, 112,118 students, and 15% of the students are bused 50,000 miles daily for the purpose of desegregation.

Since the U. S. Office of Education, the Department of Education in each state and the local school board are all involved with the delivery of Title I services, representatives from each level comprised the study's population. Top level administrators in each agency selected their representatives on the basis of involvement with Title I programs. The data

CG018124

was gathered primarily through interviews. Some of the fourteen local respondents were interviewed on three separate occasions. The two State and three Federal officials were contacted but once. Interviews at school district level were synthesized by Semiotic Analysis.* Local respondents were then asked to react to the synthesis data and to note areas of disagreement. Reactions to the unabridged version were obtained from both the State and Federal representatives. Analysis of this data formed the bases of the recommendations detailed in the Final Report.

In this paper, only one aspect of the larger study is examined; i.e., the problems which emanated from the Federal regulations which were not written to anticipate the disruptive changes of merger or desegregation. The central characters are the school administrators and the students, both caught differently in necessity's sharp pinch. Administrators were forced to comply with Title I regulations under constrained and stressful conditions. Needy students were the victims of that compliance and those constraints since many lost the services intended for them.

Seven critical problem areas are discussed: the Title I Amendment: Continuing Eligibility; Needs Assessments; Identifying Title I Recipients: School and Child; Evaluation of Students' Progress; The Parent Advisory Council (PAC); Teacher Aides; and Should the Money Follow the Child? While the seven areas have been the source of considerable debate at the three levels of government, all as yet have not been resolved. It is our purpose, therefore, to present the issues and the arguments as the members of the study population perceived them, and to pose questions and recommendations where appropriate. It is our hope that the findings might help

---

*See Appendix A

guide the reader as he analyzes the legislative debates over Title I.

THE TITLE I AMENDMENT: CONTINUING ELIGIBILITY*

The original intention of the continuing eligibility amendment was to help schools maintain Title I services when slight shifts in populations made them ineligible. The writers of the amendment did not anticipate the massive, premeditated changes accompanying desegregation, nor did they forsee the large number of Title I children who would feel necessity's sharp pinch.

The majority of the local respondents believed that the amendment had negative consequences. Some schools received funds that, because of shifting populations, were no longer eligible, and vice versa. Most harmed, several respondents claimed, were the children who needed Title I help, but were shifted to a non-Title I school. Under these conditions, a basic principle of educational systems was violated. Referred to as the principle of concentration and critical mass, this principle states that "it is wasteful to embark upon certain learning objectives unless they are going to be pursued beyond some minimal point of intensity and continuity, short of which the effort will have little, if any, worthwhile payoff" (Hostrop, 1975).

The facilitative aspects of the amendment during the first disruptive year of desegregation, according to the local administration, were that it avoided additional administrative work, allowed some programs to be phased out, and provided for some undetermined flexibility. Katz and Kahn (1966:289) refer to the fallacy of such considerations in noting that

---

*For brevity, the label "Title I Amendment" is used. In point of fact, the label refers to The Education Amendments of 1974 (Public Law 93-380) Part 116a, Subpart C 116a - 20(g) (p.11481) (Selection of Title I Attendance Areas). 116a-20(g) specifically refers to school attendance areas qualifying in previous years.

individuals often respond to the immediate, the visible, and the palpable, and neglect the dimensions of the problem which are more remote in time and space." Their predisposing factor, "cognitive nearsightedness" is certainly exemplified by the decisions made under the distressful conditions of merger and desegregation. The decision to adopt the continuing eligibility amendment, for example, responded to the immediate demands for procedural action while being less cognizant of the more remote consequences of that action. While some might argue that the consequences here might have been anticipated, it is more difficult to comprehend the policy maker's cognitive myopia in not foreseeing the possible unintended abuses which seem to have occurred.

Recommendation

The Federal Government should reexamine the effects on Title I children when large, court ordered, desegregated school districts elect the continuing eligibility amendment option.

Questions to Consider

1. Do the administrative benefits of the amendment for school districts outweigh the liabilities to educationally deprived children?
2. Should the amendment be allowed in court ordered desegregated school districts or should it be eliminated or modified?

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

The "determination of educational needs" has been viewed by some authors (Kaufman, 1972) as an essential component of planning educational systems. Coffing and Hutchison (1974:3) view it as a "deliberate process for decision-oriented inquiry into needs." They build on Cronbach and Suppes' (1969:20) useful distinction between decision-oriented and

conclusion-oriented inquiry when they explain that the methodology's purpose is "to provide useful information about needs." Here, we interpret "useful" to mean stable and helpful information which can direct the flow of Title I services.

One respondent commented that it is essential that the population be stable from the time the assessment is made to the time of delivery, but the "busing plan does not provide for stability." In the first year of desegregation, not only were assessments made prior to the final determination of the busing plan, but the adoption of the continuing eligibility amendment allowed services to remain with a particular school even if some Title I children were moved. Some children undoubtedly moved to schools which had previously not been assessed as needing Title I assistance. These children faced then the sharp pinch of losing necessary services when the district complied with the two regulation demands that did not consider long-term consequences: needs assessments and continuing eligibility.

That Title I children lost services in other school districts undergoing desegregation might be inferred from a recent Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) announcement (The School Administrator, 1977). It stated:

> Proposed regulations defining application procedures for Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) funds have been published by the U.S. Office of Education (USOE). The proposed ruling governs awards to continue compensatory education for Title I students who transfer to non-Title I schools as part of a desegregation plan.
>
> According to the proposed regulations, school districts under voluntary or mandatory desegregation since August 1, 1974, are eligible for funds. They must show attendance area changes resulting in a loss of Title I services to students who received them prior to desegregation...

The proposed regulations were published in the December 2 Federal Register. Comments must be received before January 3, 1978.

While needs assessments must be made early enough to plan the delivery of services, they must be late enough to take into consideration the bused location of each Title I eligible child. Stability, under the conditions previously described, cannot be maintained if Title I is not taken into consideration as a criterion of the busing plan. This consideration requires additional planning funds (which should not be part of the districts' Title I grant) to help to defer the cost of this more complex planning. We believe that this added "planning" cost would be far more effective and efficient for children, Title I, and the Federal Government, than "correcting" costs.

Recommendations

The Federal Government should determine if:

1. Title I is important enough to be considered an essential criterion of any busing plan in a desegregated school district.

2. Additional planning funds should be allocated to desegregated school districts to facilitate the first recommendation.

3. Title I children should be exempted from busing plans.

4. Needs assessments should be initiated only when the stable delivery of services to Title I schools and children is assured.

Questions to Consider

1. What effect does considering Title I as an essential criterion of busing have on school district planning?

2. What is the cost effectiveness of incorporating Title I considerations into a busing plan?

3. When should needs assessment be started and completed? This question must be answered under two conditions:

    a. If Title I is considered an essential criterion of the busing plan.

b. If Title I is not considered an essential criterion of the busing plan.

IDENTIFYING TITLE I RECIPIENTS-SCHOOL AND CHILD

Although the regulations require a school district to establish "reasonable criteria" for identifying Title I schools and children, many school district respondents felt that inadequate criteria (i.e., free lunch and the Toby Test) were accepted by the State and Federal agencies without question. They inferred that this was due to a lack of definitional clarity regarding which schools and children should receive Title I services. State officials believed that the definitions were clear, while Federal officials explained that Congress has been "unwilling to go further than it has in defining what an educationally deprived child is." The National Education Association recently testified in the ESAA review that "the most 'inhumane' distortion of the Title I program is the policy of singling out schools that have the highest concentration of impoverished children for funding. All children who qualify should be served" (Phi Delta Kappan, January 1978:366).

Respondents affirmed that present identification procedures missed two groups of educationally deprived children. Based on the assumption that a correlation exists between low income and deprivation, the identification of low income schools as a first step towards eligibility completely ignores a large group of educationally deprived children who come from pockets of poverty located in more affluent attendance areas and children from middle and upper economic families who have educational needs.

A recent study by the Systems Development Corporation (Phi Delta Kappan, November 1977:217) which tended to support the present identification procedures found that "to allocate money on the basis of poverty tends

also to allocate funds on the basis of low achievement, and vice versa." However, this study also conceded that "the relationship doesn't always hold true for individuals." Congressman Albert Quie of Minnesota, ranking Republican on the House Committee on Education and Labor, stated that "the current formula is based on discredited economic data and the outlandish assumption that being economically poor is equivalent to being educationally disadvantaged" (Phi Delta Kappan, September 1977:67). His bill, which focused on the allocation of funds based on educational need instead of the current poverty level formula, was defeated.

These problems of criteria were exacerbated by the continuing eligibility amendment, as one local program respondent commented,

> "Under busing many children who had the 'greatest educational need' were bused to ineligible schools. The students who took their places at the eligible schools generally had better educational achievement scores. If the Title I children had remained at their home school, few, if any, of those bused in would have been elected to receive Title I services. As it was, however, more than a few were selected as recipients, and the needy children lost Title I services at the away school."

The problem of poor targeting or of not channeling resources to students for whom they are intended has been identified as a persistent problem which "has been addressed by legislation and regulation, yet problems remain" (Lyke 1977:703). A recommendation was recently made by the American Association of School Administrators to address this issue under conditions of desegregation. They recommended that "mobility restrictions on targeting of Title I funds should be lifted so they can follow the disadvantaged child if moved to a non-Title I school as a result of desegregation" (Phi Delta Kappan, January 1978:366).

Recommendations

The Federal Government should reexamine:

1. The quality of the research and the acceptability of the economic data that links low income and educational deprivation.

2. The identifying procedures detailed in Title I regulations that emphasize the attendance area first and the child second.

3. The definition of a Title I school to make it at least as specific as the definition of a Title I child.

4. And identify the extensiveness of service loss to needy children under adopted identification procedures.

5. In light of desegregation, the administrative need for flexibility to provide Title I services to educationally deprived children irrespective of other factors.

EVALUATION OF STUDENTS' PROGRESS

Stufflebeam et al. (1971:XXV) define evaluation as "the process of delineating, obtaining, and providing useful information for judging decision alternatives." There is little disagreement among educators about the importance of evaluation as defined here, especially for programs such as Title I. Many would also agree with Stufflebeam et al.(1971:5) that "in general, schools have not responded to evaluation in a meaningful way." There was no area of this study that elicited a greater divergence of opinion among local respondents than did questions on evaluation.

Many respondents maintained that evaluation should deal with particular children because "if you're not successful with...individuals, you won't be successful with...groups." The regulations, while specifying the necessity to "get the best evaluation instrument for the objectives," provided little assistance. Some local program administrators were so disgruntled with standardized tests that they found them even "not sufficient for the gross evaluation reported to the State and Federal governments."

Interestingly, the district under study was noted as one of the first in the State to employ criterion-referenced tests in Title I.

Additional problems in the structure and administration of some of the tests were reported. The Toby Test, for example, was cited as "too simple" and "culturally biased." If these allegations are true, then judgments rendered about a child's needed program will be inaccurate. Furthermore, many American educators have maintained that two major functions of schools are socialization and transmission of culture. Tests which purport to measure the totality of American culture, yet, in fact, discriminate against some segments of it, are counterproductive to these purposes. Further research is needed in this area.

The high level of agreement among local respondents that "some test results may reflect the practice of the teachers teaching the test" indicates a test administration problem. One respondent has "caught many (school personnel) who were cheating" and says "to base anything on those tests is ridiculous." Other respondents have noted a variety of test administration problems such as: creating an unsettling atmosphere, rigidly following test procedures or allowing additional time, emphasing certain directions, etc. The reasons given for these administrative act of cheating range from making the test more difficult so more children were eligible for Title I programs to making them easier so it appeared that the teachers and children were doing better jobs than they really were. These testing manipulations do not enhance the evaluation of a child's program or the diagnosis of an appropriate program, nor do they constitute elements of the "best evaluations for a teacher's objectives."

The structural and administrative test problems may help to explain why some respondents maintained that tests are inadequate--even for gross evaluation. Respondents' reservations may be reflected in a Federal official's observation that "only by knowing the progress of individuals can we make the group determination."

Recommendations

The Federal Government should:

1. Determine if the methods in evaluating programs and children are adequate.

2. Require districts using evaluating tests to justify their suitability for each specific population.

3. Require that agents be directly involved with district and State personnel in the evaluation process.

Questions to Consider

1. Have exemplary processes of evaluation been developed and tested?

   a. If yes...then these models should be identified and disseminated to Title I school districts.

   b. If no...then NIE should initiate the development, testing, and dissemination of evaluation packages to Title I school districts.

2. Should Title I regulations specify that:

   a. All tests employed by a school district meet reasonable reliability and validity standards with all segments of the local population?

   b. Monitoring criteria assure that programs are carefully evaluated?

   c. External evaluation agents be required in addition to local evaluation personnel?

3. Should the role of parents be expanded to include training and utilizing external evaluation agents?

THE PARENT ADVISORY COUNCIL (PAC)

One partner of the merged school district, the former City District, had, by Federal assessment, an exemplary PAC operating before merger and desegregation. During the first year of merger and desegregation, parent leadership was frustrated. City parents felt a loss of personal contact with their local school, while both county and city parents whose children were bused had to adjust to new school environments and expectations. Furthermore, as some administrators dominated meetings at both the district and local school levels, parent attendance declined sharply. Some school district personnel concerned with the decline of parent involvement believed the success of Title I programs could be directly measured by the level of parental participation.

One program administrator was concerned that while parent coordinators continued to function during the first year of merger and desegregation, "they were not trained to help parents work with their children, with the teachers, or to influence educational decisions" in most of the local schools or in the district. Parents did not "feel welcome, needed and important"; they were not provided with leadership training; nor did they feel that the PAC meetings were viable to their needs and interest; therefore, they dropped out, one interviewed respondent said.

It is interesting to note that one Federal administrator cited the former city PAC as exemplary because they "had going for them one of the most important elements to guarantee the success of any PAC, namely a systematic training program." This same official also recognized the need for a "transition period after merger in which the PAC's would have to readjust."

The team concept was also apparently lost during merger and desegregation. Teachers, one interviewee noted, were not encouraged to work with

parents. The team concept of parent, teachers, supervisors, and principal working together for the best interest of the child no longer existed to any great extent. The loss of the parent involvement eventually resulted in a loss to the child.

Even though some PAC members were enthusiastic, they were not, according to their own reports, the viable force intended by the regulations. Their most positive role, they indicated, was showing a school board, frought with division, that parents from the two former school districts could work together. Recent reports (Phi Delta Kappan, January 1978:367) have indicated that parent involvement is actually much less than is intended by the regulation. Carl Marlburger, senior associate of the National Committee for Citizens in Education, told the House Elementary and Secondary Education Subcommittee that "we have concluded that the intent of this committee...has not been translated into reality, that the law has not been enforced, and that in a substantial number of school districts parent involvement is either token or non-existent."

Recommendations

The Federal Government should require:

1. That a full-time parent coordinator be provided each school district's Title I program.
2. That compensatory educational programs should increase the emphasis on parent involvement.
3. That parents should monitor their own participation.
4. That certified training programs be introduced into PAC regulations.

Questions to be Considered

1. Is parental involvement directly related to the Title I child's attaining the educational level appropriate to his age?

2. Is it intended that parents' skills, attitudes, and behaviors change as a result of their involvement with Title I program and personnel?

TEACHER AIDES

Under Title I regulations the use of educational aides to assist teachers in the instructional task must be accompanied by a coordinated program of training (See Part 116, Subpart D, Paragraph 116.32, P 11476 of the proposed rules [8/11/75]). A majority of local, state, and federal respondents agreed that all decisions related to teacher aides should be left with the school district since the district is best able to coordinate the various aspects of teaching with the objectives of the compensatory Title I program.

Office of Education officials emphasized that the Federal system "has jealously guarded local control of the public school within a framework of State responsibility." This, they maintained, is consistent with "Section 432, General Provisions Acts, which states that "Federal officials are prohibited from interfering in local matters dealing with organization, instruction, selection of materials, and personnel." They are "not in a position, by law" to be more specific about the work of aides. Interviews with local Title I program personnel revealed that many were less than enthusiastic with the teacher aide program as it now exists. Some said that too many aides lack adequate training, have no particular skill or interest, but want the money. Others contend that few teachers have the skill to use the aides effectively and none have been trained with aides.

The principal has the responsibility to evaluate aides. The respondents furthermore contend that since Title I programs are conducted in

elementary schools that are normally quite small, aide evaluation presents little or no problem, especially when coordinators, supervisors, and directors supply additional evaluative information to the principal. Expecting principals to evaluate aides may be unrealistic in light of recent studies of how the principal carries out his role. Some writers (Charters, 1962; Pellegrin, 1971; Dreeben, 1973) have emphasized that the demands and pressures on the principal to perform managerial functions leave little time for instructional matters. Pellegrin in particular (1971) states that "it is rare for principals to devote much energy to instructional matters, regardless of the desire to do so." One principal in the study population did affirm that to do an adequate evaluation, he must rely on coordinators, teachers, parents, and students for necessary information. Further complicating the matter, this same principal was uneasy in evaluating when the aides did not meet his expectations since he might hurt their feelings or, in rare cases, deprive them of employment. In the face of all this, a minority of top-level, local administrators, while not speaking to the question of adequacy, contended that these were not concerns since they felt the problems of aides were being met at the time of the study.

Recommendations

The Federal Government should:

1. Direct and encourage Federal Title I officials to disseminate to participating school districts model teacher aide programs that focus on selection procedures, job descriptions, training for both aides and teachers and methods of evaluation.

2. Encourage research into the effectiveness of aides as compared with certified teachers.

Questions to Be Considered

1. Are there Title I school districts that have exemplary teacher

aide programs?

2. Are teacher aides as effective as professional teachers in Title I programs?

3. What are the effects on learning when parents serve as teacher aides?

4. How effective is in-house evaluation to the intended outcomes of Title I programs?

SHOULD THE MONEY FOLLOW THE CHILD?

Many of the areas discussed thus far center on one highly disputed question: Should the money follow the child? Many respondents commented that "this issue has been around Title I for a long time," and some believed that "the solution is almost impossible." Few presented compelling arguments explaining why it has never been accepted.

There are three major arguments against the money following the child: (1) it is against the regulations; (2) it is not administratively convenient; and, (3) it has a "watered down effect": dispersing too few services to too many schools. Since the money follow the child question has received much attention in the past months, each of the arguments against it are reconsidered in greater detail.

Clearly, at present, there is little question that the first argument, i.e., that it is against the regulations, is true. Recent reports (Neill, December 1977) have indicated that Albert Quie's proposal to change the amendment to permit allocation of Title I funds on the basis of learning need, rather than economic need, received little support, even though this is the primary intent of Title I legislation. The majority view was voiced by the National School Boards Association (NSBS) when it said, "We endorse continued use of the poverty index as a simple and rational measure of a local school district's entitlement...testing as a mechanism for distributive

funds would be fraught with unworkable administrative problems, unnecessary costs, and funding displacements from school district to school district." The administrative convenient aspect of NSBA's opinion forms the basis of the second argument.

The second argument, i.e., it is not administratively convenient to have the money follow the child, is difficult to understand. It would seem that the problems identified by respondents in previous discussions have presented numerous examples of current conditions of "administrative inconvenience" linked to this issue: the shifts in population during the implementation of desegregation; the additional planning and funding needs which are perceived as necessary during that process; the identification of Title I eligible schools which is not based on necessarily eligible children; the existence of poverty pockets of unreached but eligible children; and the current inability to serve middle and upper income level children who are educationally deprived.

A local school level administrator indicated that "it is not 'administratively convenient' when children who have received Title I services move (or are bused) to non-Title I schools, unless that school is already eligible or can become eligible." Under these circumstances, the critical condition of continuity is not maintained and necessity's sharp pinch is felt by educators caught between bureaucratic demands and professed educational goals; and, more importantly, by the child who is entirely dependent upon the system to provide needed services. Furthermore, the same administrator also observed that it is not administratively convenient when "Title I children move to even eligible schools without additional services to accommodate the added needs."

The third argument against Title I services following the child rests on the need to concentrate the Title I funds in limited numbers of schools

so that the effectiveness of the program is not diminished. This argument rests on the assumption that if the money should follow the child, school districts would permit the uncoordinated flow of Title I children to all district schools. If the Title I regulations were fundamental to the busing plan, this would, of course, not necessarily occur. It would seem that it is easier to place enough clearly identified Title I children (and appropriate services) in specific schools than it would be to place services in selected Title I schools where the identification of the neediest children may not be so clear--or appropriate. In fact, the identification of children who are the most educationally deprived and the provision of services to that specifically identified population would seem to be a more efficient method of "concentrating Title I funds" and "increasing the effectiveness" of the program than present practices. It would also seem to be more consistent with the original purposes of compensatory education programs which were "conceived and developed in the 60's, aimed not only at aiding the disadvantaged but at improving the quality of education and of educational opportunities more broadly" (Passow, 1977).

Several respondents indicated that there is never enough money to meet the educational needs of all children. While additional funding for Title I appears to be forthcoming, there is some question about whether any amount of funding will be sufficient. Passow (1971:1) has indicated that the billions of dollars already spent have done little to upgrade achievement in urban schools. Under these conditions, we suggest that a socio-economic index be the primary determinent of allocation after all educationally-needy children have been identified.

Finally, legislation is not written in stone; it can and should be constantly reexamined and changed if necessary. If a reason exists for

allowing any regulations to stand, then there is no reason for it to be misinterpreted. In the beginning, as it is now, the emphasis has been clearly placed on the child in need and not on the circumstances or accident of his socio-economic birth. HEW (1971) has clearly stated that "low income is one of the factors used in determining the eligibility of a school district and selecting target areas, but educational deprivation is the sole criterion for participation in Title I." One must wonder whether it is socio-economics or educational deprivation that is the unresolved issue here. Would we continue to endorse "...the use of the poverty index as a simple and rational measure...of entitlement..." or by doing otherwise, would it "...be fraught with unresolvable administrative problems..."? The essence is if educational deprivation is the end, then it should be sought directly. If it is not, then it should be changed.

Recommendations

The Federal government should sponsor a rigorous nationwide study:

1. To clarify the much disputed question of the relationship between income and deprivation.

2. Using experimental design:
   a) To determine the long-term effects of Title I services on recipients and non-recipients.

   b) To determine the long-term effects on Title I children under existing procedures vs. an experimental group where the money would follow the child.

   c) To determine the cost effective relations under existing procedures vs. the experimental group where the money followed the child.

Questions to be Considered

1. Will focusing on educationally deprived children as the primary determinants of eligibility resolve the problems related to shifts in populations, poverty pockets, and the inability to serve some eligible middle and upper income children?

2. What is the most feasible strategy for administering this different method of allocation?

3. Will allowing the money to follow the child result in the "watered down" effect of too few services to too many schools?

CLOSING COMMENTS

This was a descriptive study. As in all descriptive studies, its purpose was to raise issues and questions to be further examined, rather than to answer them. The efforts made in this research to preserve a reasonable level of integrity were beyond the scope of its conception or funding level. The writers had no control over the initial proposal or requested funding, but entered, after the fact, to revise and modify several design features which were impossible to fulfill as written. Despite these efforts, this research is subject to all the inherent flaws and problems which characterize pre-experimental designs. A few of the special problems and issues require explication.

This study focused on the single year during which Jefferson County underwent both merger and desegregation. Since the conditions pre and post 1975-76 are not known and were not systematically examined, it is difficult to know which problems identified here were due to merger and desegregation. The obvious differences in perceptions among local respondents about that year compound this issue.

The sample population in this study underwent several changes. It was not a randomly selected sample, but consisted of a population selected by the local Title I Director (also a respondent) and the Consortium Director, who had subcontracted this study to the researchers. Their elimination of 11 program administrators from the sample reduced the range

of perceptions on critical issues considerably. The later inclusion of some program administrators by the researchers revealed insights and understanding that would have contributed more to this study had they been systematically studied. In fact, it is the researchers' belief that the sample should have included school-level personnel and parents to check the perceptions of some issues related.

The problems encountered with some respondents in this study raise questions as to the validity of some responses to the instrument. The xeroxed returns of the same original instrument and the xeroxing of the wrong form suggest that some administrators may have assigned the task of completing the form to a subordinate or may have collaborated with each other. This is reinforced by the fact that some returns were so identical that even the same words and partial phrases were added or eliminated. There can be little assurance, under these conditions, that the concerns among some administrators were a function of their independent but identical perceptions of the issues.

Finally, it is most difficult to address, ex post facto, regulation issues and to address meaningful recommendations and questions. Since the Congressional debates are now a matter of record (not yet available at the time of this writing), many of our questions either may already be answered or may be rhetorical to those who are in a position to answer them. Despite these problems, the researchers do believe that the preceding work has raised some valid issues and questions. Hopefully, these issues and questions have been or will be addressed systematically under the most desirable research conditions possible.

APPENDIX A

SEMIOTIC ANALYSIS*

Semiotic analysis is a rational system of reducing large quantities of data without losing the essential meaning of individual items. A series of decision rules determine how the data is organized and categorized, how essential items are identified, and how the items are interrelated.

To begin the process, one lists all the words found in a given data collection, calculates their frequency of occurrence, identifies synonyms for phrases or families of words, and substitutes the synonyms in the collection. This phase of the process is called definition reduction.

If the nature of the data lends itself to translation into a standard form such as the hypothetical statement (if, then), the second phase of semiotic analysis, called logical reduction, is initiated. In this phase the definitionally reduced data collection is categorized into sets and subsets by an a posteriori process. When the categorization is completed, each set of items is listed along the vertical and horizontal axes of a symmetrical matrix. Each item is then placed into a tentative relationship—usually a hypothetical (if, then)—with every other item to determine which items are related. When a relationship is accepted, the cell is filled by a symbolic representation of the relationship. For instance, if item A is related to item B, the symbols $A \supset B$ are placed in the intersecting cell of row A and column B, and if B is also related to A, then the intersecting cell in row B and column A is filled by the statement $B \supset A$. When A and B are so related the statement is called reversible. When the relationship is only one-way, the statement is said to be nonreversible or directional.

When all the cells of a symmetrical matrix are filled, a hypothetical syllogism or chain argument is constructed such that any cell in the matrix could be the conclusion of the argument. This conclusion would imply all the other cells of the matrix, which are called the premises of the argument. When no relationship, reversible or nonreversible, exists between variables, the intersecting cell remains void; when the variables have a nonreversible relationship, a dot (·) is placed in the nonreversible cell.

When treating data with nonreversible relationships, two alternatives are possible: one, only the reversible items are placed in an argument and the nonreversible items are ignored; or two, and more preferable, the nonreversible items are connected to reversible items by one of the other logical connectives—"and" (·), "or" (v), or "material equivalence" ($\equiv$). Negation ($\sim$) may be used with any of the above connectives when contradictory statements (items) are noted.

*Thiemann, Francis. ARIOLE: A Planning Guide. Eugene: Management Utilizing Staff Training, (MUST Program), Center for Educational Policy and Management (Research and Development Division—CASEA), University of Oregon, 1973.

The final stage of semiotic analysis is placing the conclusions of all the arguments formed from the data collection into a symmetrical matrix where again relationships are identified and arguments constructed. In the case of social science data, more than one conclusion is generally formed from a matrix. The gaps between conclusions provide the theoretical base for forming testable hypotheses that add to the state of knowledge.

Example

In a study of succession a number of hypothetical propositions were abstracted from the literature and initially categorized according to key actors such as predecessor, successor, inside successor, outside successor, and subordinate. The set of propositions concerned with the outside successor in a new role position are presented below to illustrate definition and logical reduction.

Step 1: List the propositions.

The outsider creates a new informal social circle.

The outsider is a stranger, unacquainted with the social realities of the situation.

The outsider can initially subscribe to the position of objectivity and impartiality.

The outsider does not know the informal social structure of the organization.

The outsider is unhampered by the informal social structure.

The outsider will have a difficult time being accepted.

The outsider is isolated from the informal sources of information.

The outsider is given considerable latitude in his operation.

The outsider is given full support of the board during the first year.

The outsider is at first over-accepted and over-idealized.

Step 2: Create a word frequency dictionary.

Word	Frequency of Occurrence	Word	Frequency of Occurrence
a	3	know	1
accepted	2	latitude	1
and	2	new	1

Word	Frequency of Occurrence	Word	Frequency of Occurrence
at	1	not	1
being	1	objectivity	1
board	1	of	5
by	1	operation	1
can	1	organization	1
circle	1	outsider	10
considerable	1	over	2
creates	1	position	1
difficult	1	realities	1
does	1	situation	1
during	1	social	4
from	1	sources	1
first	2	stranger	1
full	1	structure	2
given	2	subscribe	1
his	1	support	1
have	1	the	19
idealized	1	to	1
impartiality	1	time	1
in	1	unacquainted	1
informal	4	unhampered	1
information	1	will	1
initially	1	with	1
is	6	year	1
isolated	1		

In this dictionary, three words, "informal," "social," and "structure," have been used more than once and have more subsuming significance than the other words listed. The other multiple-use words are discounted because they either identify this particular set of propositions ("outsider") or are articles, prepositions, adverbs or verbs.

Step 3: Isolate the propositions containing the words "informal," "social," and "structure," and determine how many propositions can be subsumed.

The outsider creates a new informal social circle.

The outsider is a stranger, unacquainted with the social realities of the situation.

The outsider does not know the informal social structure of the organization.

The outsider is unhampered by the informal social structure.

The outsider is isolated from the informal sources of information.

Step 4: Write subsuming statement(s). In this case, the five statements can be represented by the single statement:

The outsider is a stranger.

Note: It is important that the meaning of the statements subsumed not be lost and that the statement "the outsider is a stranger" does not include or convey more than the statements from which it was drawn. Since the subsumed statements set the parameters of the subsuming statement, any subsequent use of the subsuming statement should be limited by these parameters.

Step 5: Replace the subsumed statements in the original data collection with the subsuming statement. The list of statements becomes reduced to six statements:

The outsider is a stranger. (Contained in this statement are the five subsumed statements.)

The outsider can initially subscribe to the position of objectivity and impartiality.

The outsider will have a difficult time being accepted.

The outsider is given considerable latitude in his operation.

The outsider is given full support of the board during the first year.

The outsider is at first over-accepted and over-idealized.

Step 6: Obtain a computer print out which places each statement in a hypothetical (if, then) relationship with each of the other statements. (Each statement should assume the positions of both antecedent and consequence.) If the volume of data is small, this step can be done by hand.

If the outsider is a stranger, then the outsider can initially subscribe to the position of objectivity and impartiality.

If the outsider is a stranger, then the outsider is given considerable latitude in his operation.

If the outsider is a stranger, then . . .

Step 7: Read each statement to determine if the meaning of the antecedent and consequence are the same or if the consequence further defines the antecedent. In both cases, the consequence can be subsumed and added to the original list of subsumed statements.

If the antecedent and consequence are not the same, an acceptance or rejection judgment is made. Devise a code for the list of propositions created in step 6 to note acceptance/rejection decisions. For instance, a check (✓) can indicate that a relationship is accepted, a zero (0) that it is rejected.

In reading the statements it is sometimes helpful to substitute the pronoun "he" for the term "the outsider." The reason for this is that without great care one can slip into accepting all the relationships by definition alone.

One of the statements, "the outsider will have a difficult time being accepted," was judged to be an additional parameter defining the subsuming statement, "the outsider is a stranger," and was therefore subsumed.

Step 8: Assign letter symbols to the final list of statements.

A The outsider is a stranger.

B The outsider can initially subscribe to the position of objectivity and impartiality.

C The outsider is given considerable latitude in his operation.

D The outsider is given full support of the board during the first year.

E The outsider is at first over-accpeted and over-idealized.

Step 9: Place the five statements into a symmetrical matrix using the appropriate symbols to identify each statement and to note acceptance or rejection.

	A	B	C	D	E
A		A ⊃ B	A ⊃ C	A ⊃ D	A ⊃ E
B	·		X	B ⊃ D	·
C	·	X		C ⊃ D	·
D	D ⊃ A	D ⊃ B	D ⊃ C		D ⊃ E
E	·	E ⊃ B	E ⊃ C	E ⊃ D	

As shown in the chart, when a hypothetical relationship is accepted, a symbolic representation is placed in the appropriate cell—A B, for example. If the relationship is reversible (accepted when read either way, for example, C⊃D and D⊃C), the symbols are placed in both cells. If one relationship is accepted and the other rejected, a dot (·) is placed in the rejected cell, and if neither relationship is accepted, the cells are exed (X) out.

Step 10: Create a valid argument which uses or implies all the relationships noted in the matrix.

A ⊃ E
E ⊃ B
B ⊃ D
D ⊃ C
∴ A C

In ordinary language, this argument reads:

> If the outsider is a stranger, then he is at first over-accepted and over-idealized.
>
> If he is at first over-accepted and over-idealized, then he can initially subscribe to the position of objectivity and impartiality.
>
> If he can initially subscribe to the position of objectivity and impartiality, then he is given full support of the board during the first year.
>
> If he is given full support of the board during the first year, then he is given considerable latitude in his operation.
>
> Therefore, if the outsider is a stranger, then he is given considerable latitude in his operation.

By mediate or immediate inference, each filled cell of the matrix is contained in the argument.

Step 11. Following the logical reduction of each of the sets and subsets in the total collection, a matrix of conclusions is constructed

and interrelationships are determined from which additional conclusions are drawn. In this way a few conclusions can represent a large number of statements, and essential ideas can be isolated.

A few considerations for using semiotic analysis are listed below.

1. A computer may be required when the volume of data is large.
2. Semiotic analysis is usually a time-consuming process.
3. A basic knowledge of logic and semantics is necessary.
4. It draws upon an analyst's subjective judgment.
5. Deductive relationships representing new insights or knowledge may be produced.
6. Partial theories can be constructed.
7. Essential information is isolated.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Charters, Jr., W.W. "The Social Background of Teaching" in N.L. Gage (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.

2. Coffing, Richard T., Hutchison, Thomas E. Needs Analysis Methodology: A Prescriptive Set of Rules and Procedures for Identifying, Defining, and Measuring Needs. Prepared for the Symposium on "Methodologies Under Development", Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois, April 17, 1974.

3. Cronbach, L.J., Suppes, P. (Eds). Research for Tomorrow's Schools: Disciplined Inquiry for Education. London: MacMillan, 1969.

4. Dreeben, Robert. "The School as Workplace" in Robert M.W. Travers (Ed.) Second Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally Publishing Co., 1973.

5. Hostrop, Richard W. Managing Education for Results. Homewood, Illinois: ETC Publications, 1975.

6. Katz, Daniel, Kahn, Robert. The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966.

7. Kaufman, R.A. Educational Systems Planning. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

8. Lyke, Robert. "Developing Issues in Elementary and Secondary Education" in Appendix II, Hearings before the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Ninety-Fifth Congress, First Session on H.R. 15. Part I: General Issues on Elementary and Secondary Education, May 10, 11, 1977.

9. Neill, George. "Washington Report." Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 59, No. 5, December, 1977.

10. Passow, A. Harry. Urban Education in the 1970's. New York: Teacher's College Press, 1971.

11. Passow, A. Harry. "Urban Education: The New Challenge." Educational Researcher, Vol. 6, No. 9, October, 1977.

12. Pellegrin, Roland. "Schools as Work Organizations" in Robert Dubin (Ed.), Handbook of Work, Organization, and Society. New York: Rand McNally, 1971.

13. Phi Delta Kappan, September 1977, Vol. 59, No. 1.

14. Phi Delta Kappan, November 1977, Vol. 59, No. 3.

15. Phi Delta Kappan, December 1977, Vol. 59, No. 4.

16. Phi Delta Kappan, January 1978, Vol. 59, No. 5.

17. Stufflebeam, Daniel I., Foley, Walter J., Gephart, William J., Guba, Egon G., Hammond, Robert I., Merriman, Howard O., Provus, Malcolm M. Educational Evaluation and Decision Making. Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa, 1971.

18. The School Administrator. American Association of School Administrators, Vol. 34, No. 11, December 1977.

19. Thiemann, Francis. Ariole: A Planning Guide. Eugene: Management Utilizing Staff Training, (MUST) Program, Center for Educational Policy and Management (Research and Development Division - CASEA), University of Oregon, 1973.